REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-20 remain in the application. Claims 2 and 11 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, and 10 are amended to more distinctly describe the subject matter of the invention.

A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based upon Carson et al. in view of Katzman et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 7 call for, among other things, a plurality of functional modules formed within an integrated circuit that are interconnected via a packet router that is also formed within the integrated circuit. At least these features of claim 1 are not shown or suggested by the relied on references.

Both Carson et al. and Katzman et al. deal with multiprocessor computer systems that support transactions between multiple, separate integrated circuits. A significant feature of the claimed invention is the implementation of routed, packet communications between components (functional modules) within an integrated circuit. The requirements placed on communication between functional modules of a single integrated circuit are significantly different than those placed on packet routing between multiple, separate devices. For example, as noted in the Background of the Invention, paragraph [0002] and paragraph [0003] of the instant specification, packet routing with a compact, standardized protocol is not known to be implemented within an integrated circuit.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are amended to clarify that the functional modules and the packet router are implemented within a particular integrated circuit. The Office action does not allege this element of claims 1, 6 and 7 is shown or suggested by the references. Accordingly, claims 1, 6 and 7 as well as claims 3,

8

4 and 17 that depend from them, are believed to be allowable over Carson et al. in view of Katzman et al.

Independent claim 9 calls for, among other things, an initiator functional module <u>wherein both the initiator functional module and the packet router are formed within the integrated circuit</u>. Similarly, independent claim 9 is amended to call for a target functional module <u>wherein both the target functional module and the packet router are formed within the integrated circuit</u>. These features of claims 9 and 10 are not shown or suggested in the relied on reference. As noted above, Carson et al. in view of Katzman et al. relate exclusively to multi-chip computer systems and do not show or suggest a packet communication system within an integrated circuit. For at least these reasons claims 9 and 10 are not anticipated or made obvious by the relied on references.

Independent claim 12 calls for, among other things, a method of implementing transactions between an initiator module <u>within the integrated circuit</u>, and generating a request packet <u>within said integrated circuit</u>. Carson et al. and Katzman et al. do not show or suggest a method of implementing transactions within an integrated circuit, only transactions external to the integrated circuits and conducted between separate integrated circuits. For at least these reasons claim 12 is not anticipated or made obvious by the relied on references. Claims 13-14, 16 and 19 that depend from claim 12 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Claims 5, 8, 15, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based upon Carson et al. in view of Katzman et al and further in view of Circello. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 18, which depend from claim 1, claim 8, which depends from claim 7 as well as claims 15 and 20 which depend from 12 are distinct from the combination of Carson and Katzman for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 7 and 12. Circello does not supply the deficiencies set out above. Specifically, Circello does not show or suggest that the computing system is

9

implemented within an integrated circuit. For at least these reasons, claims 5, 8, 15, 18 and 20 are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Carson et al., Katzman et al. and Circello either alone or in combination.

B. **Conclusion.**

In view of all of the above, claims 1, 3-10 and 12-20 are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

May 7, 2004

Stuart T. Langley, Reg. No. 33,940
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5335 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax

10